

## REMARKS

In the official action the Examiner sets forth a three way restriction requirement with claims 1-36 and 53-59 falling into group I, claims 37-43 and 60 falling into group II and claim 44-53 falling into group III.

The Examiner asserts that these three groups are related as sub-combination claims.

The restriction requirement implies that the Examiner finds these claims to be not to be "obvious variants" of one another. If that were not the case, then the restriction requirement would be improper.

The applicant hereby elects the claims of group I (Claims 1-36 & 53-59) for initial examination on their merits.

An action on the merits of this application is awaited.

I hereby certify that this paper (and any enclosure referred to in this paper) is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on

March 14, 2008  
(Date of Transmission)

Stacey Dawson  
(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Stacey Dawson/  
(Signature)

March 14, 2008  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Berg/

Richard P. Berg  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 28,145  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard,  
Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300 voice  
(323) 934-0202 facsimile